

JUNE 30, 1946

Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

BROADCAST BY STATIONS OF THE AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO.



Does the United Nations Give a Reasonable Guarantee of Peace?

Moderator, GEORGE V. DENNY, JR.

Speakers

CLIFFORD D. MALLORY, JR.
GEORGE FIELDING ELIOT

THOMAS K. FINLETTER
HARRIS WOFFORD, JR.

(See *also* page 12)

COMING

—June 27, 1946—

Is Food Rationing Necessary To Prevent Widespread Starvation?

—July 4, 1946—

Should the United Nations Adopt the Baruch Plan for a World Authority to Control Atomic Energy?

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 18, N.Y.

VOLUME 12, NUMBER 8



\$4.50 A YEAR : 10c A COPY



CONTENTS



The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.

THE BROADCAST OF JUNE 20:

"Does the United Nations Give a Reasonable Guarantee of Peace?"

Mr. DENNY.....	3
Major ELIOT.....	5
Mr. FINLETTER.....	7
Mr. MALLORY.....	8
Mr. WOFFORD.....	11
THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN.....	12
QUESTIONS, PLEASE!.....	17

THE BROADCAST OF JUNE 27:

"Is Food Rationing Necessary To Prevent Widespread Starvation?"

THE BROADCAST OF JULY 4:

"Should the United Nations Adopt the Baruch Plan for a World Authority To Control Atomic Energy?"

The broadcast of June 20, 1946, originated under the auspices of the Stamford Association of Organizations and Citizens for a Greater United Nations. It was broadcast from the Stamford High School Auditorium, Stamford, Connecticut, over Station WSTC, Stamford, WJZ, New York, and the American Broadcasting Company network, from 8:30 to 9:30 p.m., E.D.T.

Town Meeting is published by The Town Hall, Inc., Town Meeting Publication Office: 400 S. Front St., Columbus 15, Ohio. **Send subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, 123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N.Y.** Subscription price, \$4.50 a year, 10c a copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Illinois U Library *Town Meeting*



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

GEORGE V. DENNY, JR., MODERATOR



JUNE 20, 1946

VOL. 12, No. 8

Does the United Nations Give a Reasonable Guarantee of Peace?

Announcer:

On the first anniversary of the founding of the United Nations, the Stamford Association for a Greater United Nations and Station WSTC are the proud hosts for the 427th session of America's Town Meeting of the Air.

Stamford, Connecticut, is the first community to wage peace on a community-wide scale. Tonight marks the opening of a three-day session where the discussion started tonight will be carried on under the leadership of other outstanding national figures.

We hope that other Town Meeting listeners from coast to coast will continue their discussions, to the end that we may have peace and good will among men everywhere in the world.

The citizens of Stamford salute and welcome the genial moderator of America's Town Meeting, its founder and director, Mr. George

V. Denny, Jr. Mr. Denny. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Good evening, neighbors, and thank you, Gene Kirby.

Your Town Meeting is very happy to be the guests of this thriving industrial city which, I understand, has practically solved its reconversion problem with its 100 manufacturing concerns, 22,000 employees, 1,000 retail outlets, and vast research projects.

Everybody has heard the story of how Peter Stuyvesant bought Manhattan from the Indians for \$24, but few of us know that the Founding Fathers of Stamford, in 1641, had to give the Indians twelve knives, twelve glasses, twelve hatchets, twelve coats, two kettles, and four fathoms of wampum.

I wonder how much the United Nations would have to pay for it today if they wanted to settle here. (*Laughter.*)

When we planned tonight's program, Mr. Baruch had not presented the American plan for World Control of Atomic Energy, nor had Mr. Gromyko presented the Russian plan.

The first anniversary of the U.N. seemed to be a good time to ask ourselves if the present United Nations Organization offered the best practical means of maintaining world peace, for that is what our topic really means. But as shrewd as our program committee is, we certainly did not anticipate that two major plans of vital importance to the United Nations would be proposed within the week.

The American plan, submitted last Friday, provides, among other things, for the international control of materials essential to the manufacture of atomic bombs; world-wide distribution of plants and stock piles of such materials; complete inspection throughout every nation by a world atomic authority, which would have the power of immediate punishment for any violation of the atomic control agreement by any nation; and the abolition of the veto power with respect to the atomic agreement.

The Russian plan differs in two important respects. It retains the veto power of the Big Five—the permanent members of the Security Council — with full enforcement authority remaining in the Security

Council; forbids the use of atomic weapons under any circumstance and provides that all stocks of atomic weapons be destroyed within three months after the agreement is ratified.

The American plan provides that all atomic bombs and the knowledge how will be turned over to a world atomic authority as soon as we are satisfied that an adequate international control system exists.

These plans will necessarily play a large part in our discussion this evening but we will discuss them more fully two weeks from tonight. However, neither plan has been adopted and may not be adopted.

So tonight we want to know what the United Nations, as it stands, offers a reasonable assurance of peace. Is it the best we can do? Has it proved, after a year, to be the most satisfactory machinery we can have? Or does it lack essential principles which are necessary to maintain world peace?

Major George Fielding Eliason, nationally syndicated columnist of the *New York Herald Tribune*, has long been a staunch supporter of the United Nations, and is joining tonight in upholding the affirmative by a recently returned veteran who bears a famous name in the shipping annals of this country—Mr. Clifford D. Mallory, Jr., who served as a lieutenant commander with our Third Fleet.

The opposing view will be u

held by Mr. Thomas K. Finletter, former Special Assistant to the Secretary of State, and another veteran who has just returned from service with our Air Forces, Harris Wofford, Jr., of Scarsdale, New York, founder and head of Student Federalists.

But let's hear first from Major George Fielding Eliot. Major Eliot. (*Applause.*)

Major Eliot:

I think it will be helpful to begin by defining the terms of this discussion as I see them.

What we're really talking about is this: Is it possible to maintain peace in the world, for the time being, at least, by agreement among the principal powers?

That is what the United Nations is—an agreement among the victory powers in the late war to maintain, by common action, the peace and security of the world.

Such an agreement must rest on one fundamental assumption—that all of the participating nations place the maintenance of peace above every other national objective.

This assumption is not unreasonable. It arises from the general realization of the horrible risk of another world war—the terrible cost—from which the victor would suffer almost as much as the vanquished.

Since the coming of the atom bomb, this idea has seemed doubly compelling. It is hard to imagine

any set of human beings who could calculate that any advantage was to be derived from beginning an atomic war.

It is likewise clear that in the very face of these facts, men are talking about the next war. There's no real confidence in peace and security as yet. Great sums are being voted for armaments and for the development of new and even more deadly methods of killing human beings wholesale.

In the face of these facts, it is urged by some, notably and eloquently by my distinguished opponent, Mr. Finletter, that peace by agreement is not enough. It is urged that there must be something stronger and more definite than a mere agreement to keep the peace and to act in concert to punish a breaker of the peace. It is urged that there must be a world government with sufficient power to compel obedience to world law.

Let us examine this proposition carefully, for it is the central point of the present discussion.

To keep the peace by agreement, all the major powers must continue to agree. So long as they do so, they can restrain violence on the part of any small state.

But if a major power becomes an aggressor itself, it can be restrained only by the concerted action of the others, that is, in the last analysis, by war.

Granted that a major power desires to break the peace, the

chances of maintaining peace then rests on the cold-blooded calculations of its leaders, as to whether it has a reasonable chance of success.

Can a world government, that is, the protection of enforceable law, be substituted for this uncertainty?

If such a world government is to work, it must possess power greater than that of any single state or reasonably foreseeable combination of states. And the others must agree to give it that power.

The problem of how to create such a power is the rock on which all proposals for a world government have hitherto split. Now there appears to be some idea that the control of atomic energy by an international authority offers a way out of this difficulty.

An international authority controlling atomic energy might perhaps be so devised that it would be a super power which could constrain any law-breaking state. But, if so, it would also have the power to run the world as the persons in charge of it saw fit, unless some means of restraining them could be found.

It would be so simple to find a way to maintain peace, if power to do so could only be placed in the hands of a group of impartial and noble-hearted angels. Alas, when all is said and done, such plans have to be run by human beings.

One reason for the long-termed

success of the Constitution of the United States is the system of checks and balances by which that admirable instrument safeguards the rights of the people as a whole against human frailty and human ambition on the part of individuals.

But the Constitution was possible only because of the fact that a basic confidence existed among the men who made it and the people they represented — confidence that all were seeking the same objective: a strong and free republic.

It is precisely the lack of that confidence among nations and people which makes the world government today so difficult of attainment, because no nation, and especially no great nation, will put into the hands of others the power to constrain it, the power, perhaps, to deprive it of its independence and its way of life.

At present, we just do not have enough of the cement of confidence to glue together the foundation stones of our edifice of world peace.

The United Nations is, admittedly, a less ambitious project than a world government with power to enforce the peace, but it represents the widest area of agreement that could be found among 51 nations at San Francisco.

If it is not the foundation of a mighty palace of peace, it is at least a foundation on which patient and reasonable men can build

shelter against the storms of the future.

In so doing they may acquire, by working together, that trust in one another without which there is no hope at all for the peace and safety of nations—that trust which, alone, can form the basis of a sound system of accepted law. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Major Eliot. Well, you expected some opposition from our next speaker, so here it comes. Mr. Thomas K. Finletter, former Special Assistant to the Secretary of State. Mr. Finletter. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Finletter:

As I understand Major Eliot's argument, it is that the best possible way of maintaining peace in the world is for the big powers to develop good habits of working together. Nothing more than this. No laws, no sanctions, presumably, no effective control of atomic energy or any of the weapons of destruction—just peace by agreement when the nations can agree.

From this premise, Major Eliot argues eloquently that the United Nations, in exactly its present form, is the best possible machinery for peace.

In other words, in Major Eliot's opinion, Mr. Baruch and the United States Government have made a serious error in their recent proposals for the control of atomic energy, for Mr. Baruch's

plan says two things very clearly:

First, that in the official opinion of the United States Government, the United Nations Organization in its present form is not adequate to keep the peace.

And, second, that very important changes in the United Nations must be made immediately. Mr. Baruch calls this the choice between the quick and the dead.

The Baruch proposals would make two radical changes in U.N. First, atomic weapons would be eliminated from national armaments, and complete ownership or dominion of all sources of fissionable material and of all factories using atomic energy would be given to U.N.

If there is one particular weakness in U.N. as it is now, which makes it incapable of stopping wars, it is that it in no way controls armaments, and great national armaments make war inevitable.

Now the Baruch proposals would eliminate not only atomic bombs but other weapons as well. Mr. Baruch says in his plan that the United States will insist—as a condition of giving up the atomic bomb and the know-how — the United States must have (and I quote from the proposals themselves) a guarantee of safety not only against the offenders in the atomic area, but against the illegal users of other weapons: bacteriological, biological, gas, perhaps—why not?—against war itself. This

means a general world disarmament scheme, at least of the major weapons of mass power.

Mr. Baruch's proposals make another fundamental change in the U.N. which would radically alter its character. He would eliminate the veto of the Big Five, insofar as it applies to disarmament and the prohibition of war.

The elimination of the veto is absolutely necessary, if the proposals of the United States Government are to work. (*Applause.*) The fact that the immediate response of Russia to this proposal to eliminate the veto was negative does not mean that the United States should stop pressing for its view.

The fundamental importance of Mr. Baruch's plan is that it would convert the United Nations Organization from a League of Nations, based only on good intentions, or good working habits and agreements, as Mr. Eliot might put it, into a limited world government with adequate power to enforce the necessary disarmament and to prevent war under a rule of law.

Mr. Baruch rejects the idea, and I thoroughly agree with him, that nations of vastly different traditions and cultures can ever work out the happy condition of mutual understanding for which Major Eliot hopes, which of itself will bring peace to the world.

We do not even have this happy

understanding in our own country. We rely on law and force and government to keep the peace. Imagine what would happen if we relied on happy mutual understanding in any of our great cities and disbanded the police and the courts. The happy understanding would have anarchy and crime rampant in five minutes.

The choice is between trying to keep the peace by agreement of the dominant military powers—the method which has steadily produced wars since the beginning of history—and on the other hand giving U.N. the powers which the Baruch report would give it. The first course means anarchy and war. The second course means law and peace. Mr. Wofford and I are for law and peace. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Mr. Finletter. Our Town Meeting listeners have written in enthusiastically in praise of the veterans we've had on our programs this year, so now you're going to hear from two extremely fine young men who fought to help win this peace we're trying to make permanent.

And we hear from Major Eliot's supporter, former Lieutenant Commander Clifford Mallory, Jr., of the United States Navy's Third Fleet. Mr. Mallory. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Mallory:

During my tour of duty in the South Pacific theater, I saw terrific examples of allied unity: into

national task forces, comprised of Australians, French, New Zealanders, English, Dutch, and Americans, fighting alongside one another, fighting a tough way and a tough job.

Our goal was a clear one. Our job was a clear one. We thought out our tactical problems together, and, of course, there were differences of opinion, but the major issues were clear.

We allies in the field looked toward the joint Chiefs of Staff in Washington for the course we were to take, and then we fought our way along the best way we could, culminating in victory.

We returned to find that the allied unity we had known in the field had gone out with victory. What had happened? What had we fought for? Surely not this present state of insecurity.

Security had seemed so inevitable. How wrong we were.

World cooperation is not impossible, though peace is harder to wage than war.

So we, the veterans, now turn, not to a military body for guidance, but to the United Nations Organization.

In tonight's question, the word "reasonable" is the crux. No one feels that the United Nations is the complete solution. I'm sure the authors of our Constitution did not feel that document was perfect at its inception.

Mr. Finletter has questioned the

legal status of the United Nations. Isn't most law based on precedent? Was our Constitution considered law by the rest of the world? Definitely "yes" by those who believed in it. And here we are talking of 51 nations and not 13 colonies.

The Charter *is* now the basic law of the international community, and its laws against war and aggression are binding upon non-members, as well as upon the members of the United Nations.

Mr. Finletter has stated in the past that there is no middle ground—either we have a world government, superior to that of the nations involved, or merely an international treaty or agreement. Now, as I see it, the United Nations *is* a world-governing body, and in itself an international treaty without completely jeopardizing the national sovereignty of the member states.

Do we really feel that our 140 some odd million citizens are on an equal literate and cultural par with some of the Eastern Allies, with two or three times our population? And do we wish to be governed in the same manner as they, by a world government where our vote would be outweighed? I question this.

And the advocates of world government believe that the General Assembly, or a World Legislature, should have the right to make laws binding upon the individual. Two-

thirds of the world population have never known the democratic processes of the ballot as we know them in the Western World.

No, I don't think we want that. At least, that is not what I fought for.

Did I fight for these United States or for the entire world? Human nature is universal. Every man fought first for his country, and then, obviously, for a peaceful world to live in. We are not ready for a world government, but that does not mean that we are not ready for peace.

Do we believe that at this late date of postwar inertia we can start over again and hold another San Francisco conference in order to form a world government? In any case, we should find the same representatives of the 51 nations with this same outlook. Hardly. Man is tired. The world is tired.

We cannot keep groping for some Utopian solution. We have the machinery set up in this Charter.

Let's back it up and give it a try. I don't mean that we cannot work toward some such solution in the future. Nothing is impossible.

Did we suddenly ponder the question of tactics in the days of Guadalcanal when dozens of our men were being slaughtered? Of course not. We set the best course we knew and we fought it out, and we can do the same thing now.

Mr. Finletter has declared that

we must avoid being "taken in" by the ideas of working into the rule of law by gradual steps, and that we cannot outlaw war by international promises based only upon the good faith of nation states.

Now I should think a world government would have to be based upon good faith to a much greater degree, because there would be involved in far more of a compromise of our own sovereignty than we are now under the Charter. Also, is not gradualism with caution a better step than possible haste and disaster?

I believe that we should develop the widest possible program of economic and social advancement through the council set up for this very purpose. Also, the full use of the trusteeship system, the setting up of a strong international police force, followed by eventual disarmament.

Here is a complete plan which will strengthen the Charter without amendment. It is clear in purpose and it is practical. We veterans and millions of those of you who stayed home and supplied us with our needs now know what teamwork and unity can be.

Let's stop dreaming and groping into the dark future. To use a good G.I. phrase, let's get it there and pitch. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Clifford Mallory. Now, let's hear from Mr. Fin-

letter's supporter, on the veteran's side, Mr. Harris L. Wofford, Jr., of Scarsdale, New York, formerly of the U. S. Air Forces, founder of Student Federalists, and author of a book about San Francisco—*It's Up To Us*. Harris Wofford. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Wofford:

Thank you, Mr. Denny. I wish I could agree with Major Eliot and Mr. Mallory that the present machinery of the United Nations offers a reasonable guarantee of peace.

Any veteran would like to say: "The crisis is past. The peace is won. We can now go back to living out our lives free of the fear of another war."

That is what all of us want and hope to hear.

In another critical period, Patrick Henry once said: "It is natural for man to indulge in the illusion of hope. For my part, whatever anguish of spirit it may cost, I am willing to know the whole truth, know the worst, and provide for it. The gentleman may cry 'Peace, peace,' but there is no peace."

Tonight Mr. Finletter and I are saying that the present United Nations offers no more guarantee of peace than did the old League of Nations, that the hope of peace lies in the people everywhere working now to develop the United Nations into a real world government with sufficient power to prevent war.

Here are the hard facts as I see them.

First, the world is drifting toward war. Fear and suspicion are mounting as nations race with each other for trade markets, for allies, for bases, for atomic and bacteriological weapons.

Our planet is now a single great community, but it is a lawless community, with no over-all world government. Our world affairs are still maneuvered by professional old diplomats, speaking the same old language of promises and doubletalk that ambassadors have used for centuries — playing the same old game of power politics— heading us down the same old road to war.

The second fact is that the United Nations cannot prevent another war. The U.N. is another voluntary league having no more power to keep peace than the Geneva League. Nations can walk out at any time. Any one of the big powers of the Security Council can block the majority will of all the other ten members by the one-power veto.

Such a weak United Nations organization presents a greater temptation to imperialism, expansion, aggression, and world conquest today than did the divided world to Hitler in 1936.

Such a league of sovereign nations can promote valuable co-operation on world social and economic problems, but it cannot stop

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

GEORGE FIELDING ELIOT—One of the best known among military analysts either on the air or in the press is George Fielding Eliot. Major Eliot was born in Brooklyn, New York, in 1894. After his graduation from Melbourne University in Australia, he served with the Australian Imperial Force from 1914 to 1918. From 1922 until 1930 he served as a captain and later as a major in the Military Intelligence Reserve of the United States Army. After five years as an accountant in Kansas City, Missouri, Major Eliot began writing for fiction magazines in 1926. Since 1928 he has written especially on military and international affairs and on military defense. At present he is military analyst for the *New York Herald Tribune* and is heard regularly on the radio.

Major Eliot's books include *If War Comes*, *The Ramparts We Watch*, *Bombs Bursting in Air*, and *Hour of Triumph*.

CLIFFORD D. MALLORY, JR.—Mr. Mallory served in the Navy during World War II and was lieutenant commander with Admiral Halsey's Third Fleet. Formerly, he was professor of shipping economics at the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kingsport, New York.

THOMAS K. FINLETTER — Mr. Finletter, former Special Assistant to the Secretary of State, was born in Philadelphia in 1893. He received the A.B. and LL.B. degrees from the University of Pennsylvania. He has written several books, including the following: *Principles of Corporation Reorganization*; *Cases on Corporation Reorganization*, and *The Law of Bankruptcy Reorganization*. His newest book is: *Can Representative Government Do the Job?*

HARRIS WOFFORD, JR.—At the age of 15, Mr. Wofford enlisted his friends at Scarsdale (N.Y.) High School in forming the first student chapter of Clarence Streit's Federal Union, Inc. In 1944, somewhat over two years later, his Student Federalists, numbering several thousands in schools and colleges throughout the United States, celebrated its first anniversary as a national organization.

Mr. Wofford served with the Army Air Forces during World War II. At 19, he is the author of the book, *It's Up To Us*, which has just been published.

new Hitlers from arming. It cannot prevent aggressors from attacking.

Third, the only way to prevent world wars is to establish a world government capable of making and enforcing world laws. We need a United Nations with power to prevent aggression, with complete control of atomic energy, and with no veto applying. Upon such a limited world government, we could then build a truly democratic world federation and a united world civilization.

Fourth, the way we can stop the drift toward war is by proposing such a world government. Only a dramatic new factor entering the picture can now stop the atomic

arms race. That new factor must be the United States of America making the goal of world government the central core of our foreign policy and pressing for it through a general amending conference of the United Nations under Article 109.

China, Britain, France, and most of the small nations are already on record for some kind of world government. The next move is up to us. The world is waiting for us to act, and all we do is issue generalities about our faith in the United Nations, while at the same time we go on preparing for war, building up our Army again, establishing our bases, manufacturing and testing our bombs. This is the kind

of doubletalk which is heading us to catastrophe.

So far I may sound pessimistic, but my youthful optimism reminds me that in history's darkest days the greatest deeds are done; that in dangerous times people rise to greatness.

My optimism tells me that Americans will shortly see the simple truths in the present situation. That if the United Nations is ever to be a first step *toward* anything, we must decide where we are going and plan to take the next steps on the way. That if the United Nations is ever to be anything more than a council of ambassadors, we must work to turn it into a world government.

Already the country is waking up. I just returned from the first convention of the American Veterans Committee of the men of this war. Their platform calls for the development of world government through the United Nations. I saw there veterans from every state dedicated to the idea of world government, determined to go into politics and public opinion to fight for it.

Thousands of Student Federalists in high schools and colleges are rallying to world government. (The other day I enthusiastically told somebody we had chapters in 52 states.) Americans United, World Federalists, Federal Union, and dozens of state and local organizations are working for it. All

around the earth the movement for world federation is growing, for it is the one idea which can keep hope alive, which can arouse new enthusiasm, faith, and loyalty.

Even now signs are appearing of official action. The far-reaching Baruch report for World Control of Atomic Energy points the beginning. This can be America's first step on the road to world government, if we support it and prepare our country for the great task of rebuilding a greater United Nations. For it is the idea of world government in which lies the reasonable hope of peace. Together we can make that hope a reality. Together we can make history.

Somebody had better make history—make a better history than the years of our century so far. The time has come for world unity, and no force on earth is as strong as an idea whose time has come. Thank you. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Harris Wofford. Well, it looks as if these four gentlemen have certainly put it up to us. They can't all four be right, so there's nothing left for us to do but to think about these ideas.

Major Eliot seems to think that Mr. Finletter and his supporter are—I don't like to use this word—perfectionists, because they expect to have world government. And Mr. Finletter thinks that Major

Eliot and his supporter are perfectionists because they think that people will keep the peace by voluntary agreement.

Well, now, that's a very nice situation with which to start the discussion up around the mike. Major Eliot, will you and Mr. Mallory and Mr. Finletter join me up here? I'll stand between you and Mr. Finletter, so it won't be too bad. Major Eliot, have you a comment? We haven't heard from you for a while.

Major Eliot: Well, you know, Mr. Denny, I just want to make a comment about what you just said. I think we can all four be right—in a way. I just figure that the difference between us is a difference of timing.

Mr. Mallory and myself don't think that these things are going to happen right away. We think they have to be prepared for. We don't think that men's minds and hearts are as yet ready to accept a system of law.

Mr. Finletter and Mr. Wofford think this can be done very much more quickly than Mr. Mallory and myself do. I think that's about the only really great difference between us.

Mr. Finletter: It seems to me that the Baruch proposals do, in themselves, provide for a regime of law. Does that mean that the Major and Mr. Mallory are against the Baruch proposals?

Mr. Denny: Now, that's Mr. Finletter speaking. Major Eliot, now.

Major Eliot: No, I don't think that means that we are against the Baruch proposals, but I think, however, before they are adopted, they will be very greatly modified and practiced. I noticed that something that Mr. Finletter said perhaps illustrates what I am getting at about the difference.

He said—suppose we just depended on happy understanding in the City of New York and had no police force. Things wouldn't be in a very good state.

But there is actually that "happy understanding" down below, because the vast majority of the people of New York are law-abiding people who support the system of law which the police force represents. That isn't true in the world. That is what I mean by getting some basis of agreement before you have a system of law. Otherwise, it won't work. Remember prohibition?

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Wofford, do you have a question?

Mr. Wofford: This question of whether we are ready or not for world government is an important one.

In San Francisco, China announced that it was ready to give up its sovereignty, and nobody paid any attention to it. In November last, Britain announced it was ready to enter a world government. Nobody paid any attention

tion to it. France has put a clause permitting world government in her Constitution. Nobody has paid any attention to it. Most of the small nations are on record for it. That leaves two giant obstacles to world government — the United States and the Soviet Union.

It just happens that the next 10 years are the years when we have the leadership. We didn't earn them, they were thrust upon us. The question now is how we use that leadership. I think that we can press for world government and propose it. I think that if we did, it would sweep the earth.

I think that it is going to be a tremendous job to get America to take such a great step, and that's why I think we should begin working to prepare America now. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Mallory, do you have something to say to that?

Mr. Mallory: Yesterday, I was at the United Nations headquarters and heard Mr. Gromyko's report. It was interesting to me in that he did not refer to the Baruch report, whatsoever.

I think we should accept the Baruch report. I doubt very much if anybody will accept the report as Mr. Gromyko presented it.

However, there were two reports presented. We are getting to work on the issue. I don't think that now we should get out and discuss world government when we've

got two plans already presented and possibly more, and if we solve the atomic bomb report, we, in my mind, have solved the problem of world government and the future of the entire world. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Finletter now.

Mr. Finletter: Let's get at the question we're discussing here, which is whether or not the United Nations provides the best possible mechanism of peace.

Now these gentlemen say that they would both support the Baruch proposals which would make very radical changes in the United Nations. How is that consistent?

Mr. Denny: Major Eliot, will you take that on?

Major Eliot: It would make very radical changes, yes, of course it would; but I think Mr. Finletter goes a little too far in calling the Baruch report, even if fully implemented, a system of world government.

But the feature in the Baruch report, which is most like a world government—that is, the possession of a power independent of the nations controlling it—that is, the control of atomic energy—is the one thing the Russians don't like about it.

What the Russians have done is to propose that atomic weapons should be abolished altogether. They do not want to give armed power into the hands of an in-

ternational authority which might be beyond the control of these states, and they want what commission there is for controlling any form of atomic energy to be under the Security Council where they have a veto. Now that shows the very sharp and basic difference between the Russian approach to this subject and our own.

I don't believe that we are going to be able to get the Baruch report adopted in its entirety. One of the reasons why I think we have to go slowly and steadily on our way towards some eventual time when we can have a rule of law is precisely this character of obstacle.

Mr. Finletter: I don't think that Major Eliot has answered my question. I should like to try Mr. Mallory on that. Why is it, if the United Nations is as perfect as it is, they both want to make these important changes in it?

Mr. Mallory: I would like to ask Mr. Finletter to remember tonight's question. The question is, Is it a reasonable guarantee? No one said it *is* a guarantee. (*Applause.*)

Major Eliot: And no one said it was perfect, and no one said it was not capable of growth and development, because if it couldn't grow it would have no life; it would have no future. Of course it has to grow. Of course it has to be developed.

Think of the number of times we have amended the Constitution

of the United States. We may have to even change it into something entirely different later on. I don't know. Nobody said it is perfect. What human institution is perfect?

Mr. Wofford: I'd like to comment on the U. S. Constitution. There's been a lot of talk of it, and I think it's a good sign.

Mr. Denny: Wait a minute. Do you want to say anything further about that particular point? I think you fellows are making a great mistake. These fellows have already come over to your camp. What are you arguing about? (*Applause.*) Are you trying to push them farther away?

Mr. Wofford: Not at all. I think it's a very good sign that they are willing to take the next step toward world government. I only think that we may find that we have got to set our sights and have a clear-cut course where we're aiming.

On the U. S. Constitution, I think one reason it was formed was because a small band of men—the Federalists—Washington, Madison, and Hamilton—started campaigning for a true federation while most people were still satisfied with our own league, the Articles of Confederation.

My real question is, I wonder if people are trying to confuse the issue by repeatedly comparing the U. S. Constitution to the U.N. Charter. The U.N. Charter is

confederation, a league of sovereign units, like our own league of friendship in this country before we federated into a true Union and a government, and I wonder what is the reason for the comparison now.

Major Eliot: I'm using the Constitution as an illustration of the various points that I am making. I don't think Mr. Wofford has been listening very carefully, if he thinks I compared it with the charter of the United Nations, with which it has fundamental differences.

Mr. Wofford: It was Mr. Malory who was using the analogy.

Mr. Finletter: I think it's fine that these two gentlemen have come over to our side. (*Laughter.*)

Major Eliot: Now, wait a minute. We haven't come over to your side, and I'm very much inclined to resent Mr. Denny's remark that we have. I think he rather stepped out of line as a moderator when he said so. (*Applause and laughter.*)

Mr. Denny: George, all I was saying was that you both said that

in time you would advocate coming over to the rule of law. And that seems to me moving over toward the purposes of that side. (*Laughter.*) Now is that true or isn't it?

Major Eliot: When did we ever say anything else but that we hoped there would be a rule of law in this world? It's just that we don't think we're going to get it tomorrow morning at half-past three. (*Laughter.*)

Mr. Finletter: Perhaps I should modify what I said and say that I think it's fine that these gentlemen have unconsciously come over to our side. (*Laughter.*)

Now, really, ladies and gentlemen, very seriously, these Baruch proposals do provide a common meeting ground. The argument so far has been based on straw men and broad concepts, with everybody misrepresenting everybody else. Now, we've got some very concrete propositions to talk about, and I think as a matter of fact we are probably all on the same side.

Mr. Denny: Now, then, is a good time for us to pause briefly for station identification.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE I

Mr. Denny: As we begin our question period tonight, let me remind you that a \$25 United States Savings bond will be presented to the person asking the question which, in the opinion of our committee of judges, seems best for

bringing out facts and clarifying this discussion, provided your questions are limited to twenty-five words. Questions, please! We'll start with the gentleman on the aisle, please. Yes?

Man: Major Eliot. How can we

have confidence in U.N. when the leaders of Russia tell their people that they cannot live in a separate world — communism and democracy?

Major Eliot: I don't think that the statement has been made recently by any Russian leader that the old idea that there can be no peace between communism and democracy is still valid. It may be widely held among the higher classes in Russia, but they haven't been harping on that strain lately. I haven't heard that statement made definitely by any of the higher people in the Kremlin, although it used to be a tenet of the Marxian Doctrine.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The lady here in the blue dress. Or is it green? All right.

Lady: It's green. I want to know from Mr. Mallory, do you believe the United Nations in its present form can eliminate the race among nations for the balance of power?

Mr. Denny: Mr. Mallory. Can the United Nations in its present form prevent the race among nations for balance of power?

Mr. Mallory: That's a tough one.

Mr. Denny: Do you want to turn that over to your partner?

Mr. Mallory: I'm going to turn that one over to Major Eliot. *(Laughter.)*

Mr. Denny: All right. Major Eliot, will you tackle that, please?

Major Eliot: I don't quite know

how you race for a balance, but—

Mr. Denny: I guess what she means is balance of power between the three major powers—Russia, Britain, and the United States. Is that what you're talking about?

Lady: Yes. Always the thing that has tipped us off to wars is the race for balance of power.

Major Eliot: You mean that wars have been caused when a balance of power, existing, has been upset?

Lady: Yes.

Major Eliot: That has sometimes happened in history.

Lady: It is going on now. It went on before the last war.

Major Eliot: Do you mean—what you're really getting at I think, is that the desire for power—the reaching out for more and more power—is the cause for war? You don't think that can be checked?

Lady: No. I'd like to know how the United Nations in its present form can eliminate that race.

Major Eliot: Only by bringing about a reduction of armaments, an agreement on policies from time to time and from place to place and under conditions as they arise. You cannot exactly foresee the future. What you have to do is to provide a means by which agreements can be reached. You have to provide the habit of talking matters over and of being together.

Now, in the development of our own country we found that you had to set up a power strong

enough to compel lesser sovereignties to agree or you couldn't make it work. And that is what is being sought now by those who say that we must have world government. That power must be stronger than any of the states that it seeks to control within the limits imposed upon it by whatever constitutional arrangements you have, or it will not work.

When a group of states became stronger or thought they were stronger than the Federal Government of the United States, you had a civil war.

The matter does get back, as you say, quite justly, to the matter of power. But that is a matter which has to be adjusted by agreement, since there is no means by which you can get agreement to hand over power to a higher and superior authority which shall be stronger than any of the others.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Major Eliot. Mr. Finletter has a word on that.

Mr. Finletter: I'd like to comment on that. The question, it seems to me, was a very good one. If I may paraphrase it a bit, it is, how can you avoid the race, and the damage to peace, of power politics, unless you have an authority to stop it? It is an excellent question, and I take it that no one here would disagree with the proposition that the United States must put itself in the best possible military position to

defend itself, in other words, if there is no higher authority to control weapons. And I take it that that means, in turn, that power politics is a necessary part of national policy. I don't think the Major has answered it.

Major Eliot: I don't think I understood the question in the terms that Mr. Finletter understood it.

I do think that power is a necessary part of life in this world. I think that we all are engaged more or less in a struggle for power. I think as long as national sovereignties exist, there will continue to be, as a great factor in the discussions between them and in everything that goes on in the world, the question of power. I think the military power of the United States is an essential part, not only of our own safety, but of our influence for peace. Unfortunately, in this unhappy world, the authority and influence of a nation is very largely today based on power.

I do not see any prospect of the nations giving up that power into the hands of a superior authority at the present time. If I did, I would be very much more hopeful that Mr. Finletter's millenium will come about at half-past three tomorrow morning.

Mr. Finletter: I want to talk about another millenium. I want to know why Major Eliot thinks that this power race, this time, is not going to result in war, when

it always has in the course of history. What's new in the situation?

Major Eliot: There's something very new in the situation—two or three new things. In the first place, there is the atomic bomb. In the second place, there is the fact that there are only two great powers which have to agree. The situation contains many more hopeful factors than before. In the third place, there is the fact of world communication of thought, interrupted as it may be by artificial means by various states. Still, peoples do talk directly to one another and know a great deal more about one another than they did. There's a lot of hope in it. I'm not despairing of the situation, at all.

Lady: Mr. Finletter. If Russia should consent to eliminate the veto power, would the United States Senate also consent?

Mr. Finletter: I'd like to be a prophet on that, or rather, I'd like to say that I think it's a mistake to constantly duck behind the United States Senate. It seems to me that there is no reason to assume that if the people of this country want a policy carried out that the Senate is going to block their wishes.

Major Eliot: I'm just wondering whether the recent vote in Nebraska encourages Mr. Finletter to think that the people of this country want all that so quickly.

Mr. Wofford: This comes back

to the same three-thirty o'clock thing. The point is that if it's needed, we've got to start working for it. I do think America can be organized for this. I think we're much further along than our statesmen and our commentators think. (*Applause.*)

Man: Mr. Wofford. Do you believe that at this point the United States or Russia would be willing to join any organization without the guarantee of a veto power?

Mr. Wofford: That's the same question. I think that the point is we've got to propose it, but no one would know who would accept it until we proposed it. Once we do propose it, and call a world constitutional convention under the U.N., then we can see what the reaction is. As I said before, I think the idea would sweep the earth. I think the preliminary to that must be that we prepare America to play its part in it. That's why I say it's up to us.

Lady: Major Eliot said that the Russians did not like the Baruch proposals on the control of atomic energy. I wonder, are we going to do the same thing with the atomic bomb that we did with our battleships a few years ago.

Major Eliot: I judge from the Baruch proposals that there is no intention on the part of the United States Government to give up the possession or the manufacture of the atomic weapon until there is

established a system of safeguards, which the Government consider adequate to secure us against violations of the agreement.

Mr. Finletter: The point has been very clearly made by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and by Secretary of State Byrnes that the guarantees that we are going to insist on before we give up the bomb are going to be real guarantees. They are going to be something like the full Baruch report. They are not going to be these vague promises on which Major Eliot is willing to rely.

Major Eliot: Mr. Finletter, I challenge you to produce any word that I have ever said or written which indicates that in the matter of the control of atomic energy I am satisfied to depend upon vague promises as a safeguard.

Mr. Finletter: I've had the impression that that was the burden of Major Eliot's remarks this evening.

Major Eliot: Well, Mr. Finletter, in that case I can only deplore your inability to understand the English language, or else my inability to speak it clearly and distinctly. (*Laughter.*)

Mr. Finletter: I take it that that is a confirmation of the fact that the Major has come over to our side. (*Applause.*)

Major Eliot: I take that as a confirmation of Mr. Finletter's ability to understand English.

Lady: Mr. Wofford: Why has

Russia consistently refused to admit our responsible correspondents to her country? If U.N. Council is to succeed, we certainly must have an understanding of the inside. The Russians insist on fact-finding . . .

Mr. Denny: Is this a question or a speech, lady? (*Laughter.*)

Lady: No, it's a question. I'm getting to it right now.

Mr. Denny: We got the first part of the question, but I don't know whether Mr. Wofford is competent to answer it or not. Go ahead.

Lady: The Russians insist on fact-finding in Spain. Why don't they give the world the same opportunity to take a peek behind their iron curtain?

Mr. Wofford: It's a good question, but I'm not the one to answer it. The part that I would like to comment on is the part about the necessity for agreement with Russia. I think Mr. Finletter and I would maintain tonight that the only fundamental agreement that we can have with any big power, including Russia, is one under law, and that's what we are proposing.

Mr. Mallory: I'm glad you're on our side. As I said, I heard the proposals yesterday. It took an hour and 20 minutes for the Russian delegate to make his speech because half that time was due to translation, even though

APR 30 1941

Mr. Gromyko speaks very good English.

That is not cooperation as I know it. If we can't do it now, then why are we bothering to talk of world government? Let's get down to translating the speeches of today and stop looking into the future, planning for translating speeches of tomorrow.

Mr. Wofford: So far, we've never proposed world government to Russia; and I think that short of the full proposition of world government, there can be no answer. All that we have today, all that we propose to put up to Russia, is a disunited chaotic world, which tempts the aggressive clique in the Soviet Union to move out and play power politics like any other big nation.

I think that the first thing we've got to do is propose a full, fair, and honest proposition to Russia. I think that proposition can't be power politics. I think the proposition, the only proposition, which will fit these times is world government.

Mr. Mallory: I wish to remind Mr. Wofford that the Baruch proposition was proposed to Russia, but they didn't even thank Mr. Baruch for the proposal. (*Applause.*)

Man: I want to ask Major Eliot a question. Would not a partial world government, the only kind that's possible today, actually drive Russia and her satellite states into

a tighter and even more hostile combination?

Major Eliot: If it was a world government, sir, Russia would be a part of it, if it was truly a world government. It is quite true that some proponents of world government have suggested that if the Russians won't come along, then let us form a world government or a partial world government with those states which will come along.

But that does seem to me to contain the danger of dividing the world into two parts. And I'm very much afraid that that would be regarded with grave suspicion by the Russians.

Mr. Finletter: I don't see why we can't stay on the subject. The subject is, does the United Nations provide a reasonable guarantee of peace? Now all of this talk about world government of various kinds is not strictly pertinent. The point that I want to make is that the Baruch proposals do provide, in effect, for a limited world government. And that is what I am talking about.

Major Eliot: Well, Mr. Finletter, your partner just said that we have never offered the Russians world government. Now you say we have. Well, if we have offered them world government in the Baruch report, so far their reception of it has not been very encouraging.

Mr. Finletter: Now, that is the

big point, ladies and gentlemen. We have not offered anybody the Baruch proposal. They are only the proposals of the Executive Branch of the United States Government. It requires Senate approval before they can be put into effect. And in order to get Senate approval, you must have aroused public approval demanding it.

Man: My question is addressed to Mr. Mallory and to the house. Is not present international difficulty due to bigotry and impatience to make others like us, whereas compromise of the best of all systems is needed?

Mr. Denny: Mr. Mallory. I think he wants a yes or no answer.

Mr. Mallory: I'm not going to answer yes or no on that. I think that the first part of it is rather obvious in itself. The point that we're trying to put across is that we have the machinery; we have the setup. Now the thing to do is to go to work with it and make no compromise other than follow along the lines which have been laid down and which have been proposed, such as the Baruch plan, which I say we should adopt.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Mallory. Now while Mr. Finletter and Major Eliot prepare their summaries for tonight's discussion, here's Mr. Kirby with the announcement of our next two weeks' program.

Announcer: Two weeks from tonight we will continue our dis-

cussion in this field. From Chataqua, New York, where we will begin a series of four broadcasts from that nationally famous Chataqua Institution, on the shores of Lake Chataqua, our subject will be, "Should the United Nations Adopt the Baruch Plan for a World Authority to Control Atomic Energy?"

Next week our program will originate in Oglebay Park in Wheeling, W. Va., where we will consider another question which deeply concerns everyone of us, "Is Food Rationing Necessary to Prevent World-Wide Famine?" The speakers will be Senator George D. Aiken, Republican, of Vermont, Harold Weston, Executive Director of Food for Freedom, Incorporated, Senator Bourke B. Hickenlooper, Republican of Iowa, and Fred H. Sexauer, farm leader, director and former president of the Dairymen's League Cooperative Association.

In case you missed any part of tonight's program, remember that you can secure a complete copy in the Town Meeting Bulletin, which is published each week for your convenience. You may secure it by sending 10 cents to Town Hall, New York 18, New York.

Now, for the summaries of tonight's discussion, here's Mr. Denny.

Mr. Denny: And here's Mr. Finletter with a summary for the negative.

MR 301947
Mr. Finletter: Mr. Wofford and I believe that what is wrong with our opponents' argument is that they are too idealistic. We think that they rely much too much on the good faith of nations and on the promises of nations acting in an anarchy of sovereign states.

Mr. Wofford and I believe that the Baruch proposals should be adopted. We further believe that the full implications of the Baruch proposals are for the rule of law, and if accepted, would provide a worldwide rule of law. We further believe that these proposals provide a common meeting ground for all sides and shades of opinion. And we think it is of the utmost importance that the people of America get back of these proposals and demand that they be accepted. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Finletter. Now, Major Eliot, for the affirmative.

Major Eliot: Mr. Mallory and myself do not rely, as Mr. Finletter puts it, on good will, and all that sort of thing. We think that the present system of agreement is the best that we can get now. We think it is susceptible of improvement; we know that it can be greatly improved.

We know that a system of law requires agreement on the part of those who are to submit to it. Either it must come from the consent of the governed, freely given, or it

must be imposed by a tyrant. We know that we've just been through a terrible war to prevent the sort of law that is imposed by a tyrant. We are now engaged in trying to create the basis of common agreement, which is essential to that system of law, which is the only kind that we Americans recognize—the kind of law that comes from the free consent of those who are governed by it.

We do not believe that the world has as yet reached the stage where such a system of law is possible. We think we are passing through the interval before peace—the interval in which the necessity of survival marches side by side with the necessity of finding a means by which that survival may be made permanent under a rule of law. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Major Eliot, Thomas Finletter, Clifford Mallory, and Harris Wofford. And thanks, also, to our host, the Stamford Association for a Greater United Nations and Station WSTO.

Our committee of judges appears to have awarded a \$25 United States Savings Bond for the question that the speakers also liked—"Do you believe the United Nations, in its present form, can eliminate the race among nations for balance of power?"—asked by Miss Ruth—we didn't get her last name. If she'll come up after the broadcast, we'll give it to her. Congratulations, Ruth. (*Applause.*)